

1 FREDERICK P. FURTH (No. 38438)
2 MICHAEL P. LEHMANN (No. 77152)
3 THOMAS P. DOVE (No. 51921)
4 ALEX C. TURAN (No. 227273)
5 THE FURTH FIRM LLP
6 225 Bush Street, 15th Floor
7 San Francisco, California 94104-4249
8 Telephone: (415) 433-2070
9 Facsimile: (415) 982-2076

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

11 (Additional Counsel are listed on Signature Page)

12 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
13 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
14 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

15 MICHAEL BRAUCH, a resident of San Francisco, and ANDREW MEIMES, a resident of New York, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,) CASE NO. C:05-2743 MHP
16) NOTICE OF PENDENCY OF OTHER ACTION OR PROCEEDING
17 Plaintiffs,)
18 vs.)
19 INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,)
20)
21 Defendant.)
22 _____)

23 Pursuant to Civ. Local Rule 3-13, plaintiffs Michael Brauch and Andrew Meimes (“Plaintiffs”) identify the following cases in which substantially similar antitrust law violations are alleged to have occurred due to Intel Corporation’s (“Intel”) use of its substantial market power to unlawfully maintain its monopoly by engaging in a relentless campaign to coerce customers to refrain from dealing with Advanced Micro Devices, which resulted in customers paying higher prices for x86 microprocessors and left them with fewer buying choices for such microprocessors.

24 Each of the following cases therefore relates to the general subject matter
25 alleged in this action.

1. *Damon DiMarco v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:05-cv-00627, filed in the
2. United States District Court for the District of Delaware on
3. August 25, 2005, and assigned to Judge Joseph J. Farnan, Jr.
4. *Bill Richards, et al v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:05-cv-00672, filed in the
5. United States District Court for the District of Delaware on
6. September 15, 2005, and assigned to Judge Joseph J. Farnan, Jr.
7. *Stuart Schupler v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:05-cv-00674, filed in the United
8. States District Court for the District of Delaware on September 16,
9. 2005, and assigned to Judge Joseph J. Farnan, Jr.
10. *Robert Marshall dba Marshall Realty v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:05-cv-
11. 00686, filed in the United States District Court for the District of
12. Delaware on September 20, 2005, and assigned to Judge Joseph J.
13. Farnan, Jr.
14. *David Kurzman v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:05-cv-00710, filed in the United
15. States District Court for the District of Delaware on September 29,
16. 2005, and assigned to Judge Joseph J. Farnan, Jr.
17. *Nathaniel Schwartz v. Intel Corp.*, No. 05-22262, filed in the United
18. States District Court for the Southern District of Florida on
19. August 16, 2005.
20. *Cory Wiles v. Intel Corp.*, No. 05-2605, originally filed in Tennessee
21. State Court, Shelby County, Memphis, Tennessee on July 15, 2005,
22. removed by Intel Corp. to the United States District Court for the
23. Western District of Tennessee on August 18, 2005.
24. *Andrew Armbrister, et al v. Intel Corp.*, No. 05-cv-212, filed in the
25. United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee on
26. August 19, 2005, and assigned to Judge Green.

27. On July 11, 2005, Plaintiffs filed a motion with the Judicial Panel for
28. Multidistrict Litigation (“Judicial Panel”), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1407, requesting that all

1 pending and subsequently filed actions in this and other district courts be transferred and
2 coordinated or consolidated in the Northern District of California for pretrial proceedings.
3 On August 5, 2005, Plaintiffs filed a Reply Submission with the Judicial Panel withdrawing
4 their §1407 motion and instead advocating transfer to the District of Delaware. A copy of
5 the §1407 motion was lodged with the clerk of this Court on July 11, 2005 and a copy of
6 the Reply Submission was lodged with the clerk of this Court on August 5, 2005. The
7 Judicial Panel heard oral arguments regarding the §1407 transfer motions on September 29,
8 2005 and took the matter under submission. The Plaintiffs believe that coordination of the
9 foregoing cases pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1407 (Multi-District Litigation Procedures) will
10 avoid conflicts, conserve resources and promote an efficient determination of the action.

11 Dated: October 6, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

12

13 By: /s/ Alex C. Turan
14 Michael P. Lehmann
15 Thomas P. Dove
16 Alex C. Turan
17 The Furth Firm, LLP
18 225 Bush Street, 15th Floor
19 San Francisco, California 94104-4249
20 Telephone: (415) 433-2070
21 Facsimile: (415) 982-2076
22
23 Francis O. Scarpulla (41059)
24 Law Offices Of Francis O. Scarpulla
25 44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400
26 San Francisco, CA 94104
27 Telephone: (415) 788-7210
28 Facsimile: (415) 788-0707
29
30 Craig C. Corbitt (83251)
31 Zelle Hofmann Voelbel Mason & Gette, LLP
32 44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400
33 San Francisco, CA 94104
34 Telephone: (415) 693-0700
35 Facsimile: (415) 693-0770
36
37 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Michael Brauch and
38 Andrew Meimes